



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,661	07/24/2003	Peter Yeung	095P34	8914
51590	7590	03/31/2006	EXAMINER	
NEXUS LAW GROUP LLP 1500 - 701 WEST GEORGIA STREET VANCOUVER, BC V74-1C6 CANADA			BASICHAS, ALFRED	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3749	

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/625,661	YEUNG, PETER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alfred Basichas	3749	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/22/03; 11/05/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,802,310.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because, as regards claims 1-7 the general scope is the same. As regards claims 8-10, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated two of each component into the

Art Unit: 3749

invention disclosed by U.S. Patent No. 6,802,310, since it has been held that to provide duplicate parts for multiplied effect is not the type of innovation for which a patent is granted. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., Inc.*, 193 USPQ 8, 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chiang (5,469,837), which shows all of the claimed limitations. Chiang shows, among other things,

1. A range hood for exhausting gases comprising: an outer hood body (see at least fig. 6); a motor housing 10 having top, bottom and perimeter surfaces defining an enclosure and having an air outlet (not shown, but inherent; the exhaust must go somewhere) and at least one opening 11 defined in said bottom surface, said motor housing being mounted within said hood body; a motor 12 and a fan 13 mounted within said motor housing; a tray 20 having a side walls 30, a floor and a drainage hole 41, at least one air inlet opening being located in said side wall, said tray being in abutment with said motor housing located below said opening in said bottom surface; and a bottom panel (see at least bottom flat portion of 20) releasably connectable to said hood body.

2. The range hood of claim 1 wherein when said bottom panel is connected to said hood body said tray projects through said bottom panel such that said at least one air inlet (between walls 30) is located below said bottom panel.

3. The range hood of claim 1 wherein said tray further comprises an annular ring, said annular ring connecting to said motor housing and having a horizontal portion positioned below said fan (see at least fig. 2).

4. The range hood of claim 1 further comprising spray dispensing means 43,51,52.

5. The range hood of claim 1 further comprising a hose 51 and spray nozzle 43, said hose being seated in said side wall of said tray and said nozzle being positioned so as to direct cleaning fluid under pressure towards said fan and motor housing interior (see at least fig. 6).

6. The range hood of claim 5 wherein said hose and nozzle are further seated on a support stand projecting from said floor of said tray (see at least fig. 6).

7. The range hood of claim 1 wherein said tray wall has a plurality of said air inlets (see at least spaces between walls 30).

Art Unit: 3749

8. The range hood of claim 1 comprising two of said motors and two of said fans and wherein said motor housing comprises two substantially similar air chambers, each chamber having one of said at least one openings defined in said bottom surface, a motor and fan being housed within each chamber above said openings (see at least fig. 1).

10. The range hood of claim 8 further comprising two of said trays, one tray positioned below a first of said air chambers and a second tray positioned below a second of said air chambers (see at least fig. 1).

It should be noted that, while Chiang does not specifically recite the hood being used with a range, the term range has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

5. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Chaing, Zhang, and Xu as applied in applicant's international application no. PCT/CN2004/000580 and/or Grant as applied in applicant's international application no. GB0412292.5. (Copies of the search reports are cited on the PTO form 892 and attached hereto.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3749

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang (5,469,837), which discloses substantially all of the claimed limitations. Chiang does not specifically recite,

9. The range hood of claim 8 wherein said tray is adapted to encompass both said openings.

The claimed orientation reciting a single large tray rather than two individual trays is an obvious modification based on design choice, and depends on manufacturing costs and

Art Unit: 3749

considerations. In view of the absence of criticality for this particular design, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate it into the invention disclosed by Chiang, so as to provide for manufacturing costs and considerations.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred Basichas whose telephone number is 571 272 4871. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday during regular business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ehud Gartenberg can be reached on 571 272 4828. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872 9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center telephone number is 571 272 3700.

March 27, 2006


Alfred Basichas
Primary Examiner